1 /

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ANTHONY BRODZKI,

Plaintiff,

v.

JIMMY JACKS, et al.,

Defendants.

2:12-CV-2060 JCM (RJJ)

ORDER

Presently before the court is *pro se* plaintiff Anthony J. Brodzki's fourth motion for temporary restraining order. (Doc. #16). Plaintiff requests this court to issue a temporary restraining order "to end the harassment by police and civilian population." (Doc. #16). Plaintiff previously moved for temporary restraining orders on February 10, 2012, (doc. #6), February 22, 2012, (doc. #8), and February 27, 2012 (doc. #11), and the court denied those motions (docs. #7, #9, and #12).

According to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65, a court may issue a temporary restraining order when the moving party provides specific facts showing that immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage will result before the adverse party's opposition to a motion for preliminary injunction can be heard. The Supreme Court has stated that courts must consider the following factors in determining whether to issue a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction: (1) a likelihood of success on the merits; (2) a likelihood of irreparable injury if preliminary relief is not granted; (3) balance of hardships; and (4) advancement of the public interest. *Winter v. N.R.D.C.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008).

1	Plaintiff's requested relief is too vague to be appropriate for injunctive relief. Further,
2	plaintiff has not made a sufficient showing under the four Winter factors. (See Doc. #16).
3	In the court's March 3, 2012, order denying plaintiff's third motion for temporary restraining
4	order, the court ordered plaintiff to show cause "why a pre-filing order enjoining plaintiff from filing
5	further motions for injunctive relief without leave of court should not be entered." (Doc. #12).
6	Plaintiff never responded to the order to show cause.
7	Accordingly,
8	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that pro se plaintiff Anthony
9	J. Brodzki's fourth motion for temporary restraining order (doc. #16) be, and the same hereby is,
10	DENIED.
11	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff is hereby enjoined from filing further
12	motions for injunctive relief without leave of court in this case.
13	DATED April 27, 2012.
14	
15	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
2728	
20 in	

Case 2:11-cv-02060-JCM-RJJ Document 17 Filed 04/27/12 Page 2 of 2

James C. Mahan U.S. District Judge